

VU Research Portal

Apocryphal citizenship: anthropologizing the citizenship debate in Latin America

Salman, A.J.

published in

Journal of Urban History
2004

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1177/0096144204266739](https://doi.org/10.1177/0096144204266739)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Salman, A. J. (2004). Apocryphal citizenship: anthropologizing the citizenship debate in Latin America. *Journal of Urban History*, 30(6), 853-873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0096144204266739>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Journal of Urban History

<http://juh.sagepub.com/>

Apocryphal Citizenship : Anthropologizing the Citizenship Debate in Latin America

Ton Salman

Journal of Urban History 2004 30: 853

DOI: 10.1177/0096144204266739

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://juh.sagepub.com/content/30/6/853>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[The Urban History Association](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Urban History* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://juh.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://juh.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

APOCRYPHAL CITIZENSHIP

Anthropologizing the Citizenship Debate in Latin America

TON SALMAN
Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

This article argues that studies and promotion of citizenship falls short if they forget that perceptions and practices are also informed by culture. Concretely, referring mainly to Chile, Ecuador, and Bolivia, it states that (mainly poor) people on one hand “subvert” the official canon with regard to citizenship by practicing it particularistically and looking for favors rather than “rights,” whereas on the other hand, awareness with regard to rights exists. People’s experiences, however, have taught them, in concrete encounters with state representatives, not to insist on their rights but instead to try for the “favor.” Nevertheless, in evaluating such encounters with the state, people show that they understand the clue of “universal rules” and the “rule of law” very well.

Keywords: *citizenship; Latin America; personalism; anthropology; urban culture*

On his face something in between pretending being shocked and a grin, the police officer sees the jalopy coming down the one-way street from the wrong direction. He raises his hand and approaches the car, the window obediently being opened. The discussion opens through, on one hand, the accusation of having committed a traffic infraction and, on the other hand, the drivers’ argument that no one-way sign was placed at the other corner, the spot where the wrongdoing according to the officer had begun. The officer points to the fact that the new one-way arrangement had been effective for over a month and that the driver should have noted “that all cars turned off at that spot.” At first, the driver angrily counters that he cannot be obliged to “know” because the new rule “had been in place since over a month” and that the argument that “everybody else turned there” is close to ridiculous as a suggested base for due transit conduct. But noting that the officer becomes irritated, he lowers his tone.

Then the discussion gets down to the grain, when the officer asks, “And how are we going to solve this, *caballero*?” Cutting a long story short, the driver, promising “to be more careful in the future,” pays the police officer a small payola, after having driven him two blocks further, because, as the law enforcement officer remarked, “here people are watching.”

An indigenous woman renews her *carnet*, her obligatory identity document, that expires every five years. After having waited the normal two hours queuing, she pays a little more than the official charge for this bureaucratic routine because the functionary promises that in that case "it will only take 8 days." After collecting her new *carnet*, she notices, back home, that her last name has been spelled wrong. Aware of the fact that this will produce a lot of trouble in every future bureaucratic action, she returns and queues again, only to hear that she will have to pay another amount of money to have the error corrected. She protests and claims that the mistake was made by the typist and that her name was spelled correctly on the application form (which she had to pay for) and the birth certificate (which she also had to pay for) she handed in. But the counter clerk remains deaf to her arguments and after some quarrelling transmits his impatience to the people standing behind her. Because she has no money with her, she returns home, queues again the next day, pays the amount requested (without getting a receipt, because, as the clerk explains, "she already got one the first time"), and receives her *carnet* seventeen days later, because the first and second time she went to pick it up, it had not been certified yet by the official in charge who was "on journey." She extensively thanks the clerk when he hands her the document.

Both these stories occurred in La Paz, Bolivia. But they could also have taken place in Quito, Bogotá, or Lima, or most any place in Latin America. What do these anecdotes tell us? From the standpoint of a U.S. or European citizen, the first thing that stands out is that both the driver and the indigenous woman did not insist on his and her *right* to be treated justly by state officials. The driver did not stick to demanding his rights as a driver to be properly informed about traffic ordinances to evade wrongdoing. In Europe or the United States, he probably would have won if he had taken the thing to the police station or, if necessary, to court. But he voluntarily forsook the whole universe of entitlements to proper information, to being punished only for "blamable" offences, to being exempt from abusive state functionaries, in short, *to get his right*. The indigenous woman did not insist on her rights as established in the procedures and did not push too hard her obvious entitlement to a free-of-charge correction. She paid for an error she did not commit. She gave in to the abusive functionary, endured queuing in vain twice, and held up a polite posture when finally handed her credential.

Although the differences might be gradual rather than total, there seems to be a greater tendency among Latin Americans to cope with obvious violations of correct treatment by representatives of the state than there would among Europeans or inhabitants of the United States or Canada.¹ It appears plausible that a different experience of citizenship is behind this readiness. The problem becomes most visible in situations as were just described. People, although strong feelings of indignation and anger might take possession of them during or after the collision, in the end opt for an alternative, and apparently ignoble, way out. It looks like they understood, during the course of their encounters

with instances that ought to endow their rights, that other strategies are more fruitful. This makes it plausible that their understanding of rights, although the concomitant official formulations might be similar with those heard in Europe or the United States, points at different contents for the same term. In this article, I concentrate on the Latin American *practices* of citizenship rather than on the written versions.

I feel that much of the abundant recent literature on citizenship focuses on the *deficiencies* of the system and its institutions and on the alleged *absence* of citizenship awareness among the (poor) Latin Americans. Hence, a characterization in its own right of what *is* going on in and among these “noncitizens,” and in their relations with the political sphere, remains out of sight. The framework is one of a culture in which something is *absent*, and the study of what is *present* is neglected. Missing is the attention for the way in which rank and file apply, use, and understand the terms in which the citizenship concept is usually aired. Missing is also a possible plural understanding of the contents and “sense” of concepts like politics, democracy, and citizenship.² In a critique on these approximations, Rosaldo asserted that we “need to understand the way citizenship is informed by culture, the way that claims to citizenship are reinforced or subverted by cultural assumptions and practices.”³

This article aims to contribute to this understanding, focusing on Bolivia, Ecuador, and Chile.⁴ Setting out the argument, I suggest that what ordinary people make of citizenship has two aspects. First of all, there is, in a way, a true apocryphal side, a series of significations with respect to citizenship that reflect a lifetime of virtual nonexistence of the classic contents such as individual sovereignty, equality vis-à-vis the law, respect in treatment irrespective of family name, appearance and prestige, effective access to public positions, individual liberties,⁵ and the like. What people, in such a situation, *want* from the system is not the full implementation of these classical contents but a somewhat better outcome of the mechanisms they actually apply. What they aim for, for instance, is a little less deceit, lying, and rudeness in the interpersonal exchanges with functionaries and “high individuals” and to receive a somewhat better treatment and outcome. This results in a series of latent as well as manifest desires that do not reflect classical contents but longed-for modifications of current practices.

At the same time, however, the notions echoing the official and legitimate rights attached to citizenship are not completely lacking. They are present in the minds of the people and influence the ways they formulate their evaluations of unpleasant experiences. People have knowledge of, and *mentally* apply, criteria and images about political rights, civil rights, and social rights;⁶ about “decency” and transparency of the political system and politicians; about probity and decorum in exchanges with state functionaries or, for instance, local leaders and brokers. People also know that in many cases, these criteria are violated. However, they do, in their interaction with these interlocutors, not refer to these rights. They know—they have learned—that it is

counterproductive to try to oblige someone to do something for you or to allow you something *because you have the right*. Instead, they prefer to play according to the rules of the game, that is, imploring rather than demanding; charming rather than claiming; “relating” rather than requesting efficient, anonymous transaction. But in evaluating the state’s treatment and societal manners, they denounce inequality, impunity, rudeness, political dishonesty, and their proper right-lessness, and they do so referring to the written, official citizens’ entitlements. Citizenship appears to be an ambiguous notion.

However, a few conceptual matters need to be dealt with before we can enter this issue. First of all, the notion of citizenship as discussed in such a context needs more precision. According to the classical triad by Marshall,⁷ the (English!) citizen conquered, in the course of history, three types of rights. Civil rights were born in the eighteenth century. They refer to the rights to individual freedom, the right to go where one pleases (and thus went against slavery, bondage, and serfdom), the right to speak one’s mind, to own property, to conclude contracts, and most important, to impartial justice. These rights opposed serfdom, tyranny, censorship, compulsory state religion, and arbitrariness. The concomitant institutions are the law and the court of justice.

Political rights stem from the nineteenth century. They involve the right to participate in public, representative institutions, both as voter and as representative, and the right to associate to defend common interests. These rights counteracted the absolutist state, institutionalized elitism, restricted suffrage, and legal exclusion from functions and positions. The concomitant institutions are parliaments, councils, and other representative bodies.

Social rights are an inheritance from the twentieth century. They enclose the right to a minimal participation in national wealth and to a standard of living fitting the national standard. These rights enable the full exercise of the first two types of right. The situation these rights opposed were the socioeconomic cleft in society; the estate society; and the lack of real opportunities, chances, and state care (in education, health care, housing, etc.) for the poor masses. The institutions that embody these rights are the welfare state and the national education, housing, and health systems.

Clearly, Marshall’s scheme does not seamlessly fit Latin America’s history or present. Nevertheless, it serves as a heuristic device to sensitize ourselves for certain aspects of the (in)existence of rights.⁸ Also, it formed the basis under the articulation in recent years of a “fourth dimension” of rights, the collective or ethnic rights.⁹ Furthermore, it served and still serves as a tool to analyze where and how these rights have not, or only half-heartedly, or in a different order, been established.¹⁰ Additionally, and more important, in combination with the argument about “deviating” understandings of citizenship, it makes us realize that there exists a crucial complementary dimension to any theoretical elaboration of rights or citizenship. The whole issue only makes sense if and when people have some knowledge and awareness of these rights and, if necessary, *make* state institutions, or other actors and resorts, apply

them. Clearly, warranting these rights in constitutions and legislation, as is the case in Latin American countries, is not enough or the central issue; and dealing with them only in legalistic or stipulative modes makes the whole thing clueless. The formal existence of citizens' rights has to be complemented by an active notion and attitude of being entitled to enjoy these rights or of being entitled to enjoy a *particular* form of them. The attitude of citizenship, then, has to be *learned* to make it happen—either “righteously” or deviatingly. It seems to be in this dimension of internalization of a special self-esteem *as* citizen that the problem can be located.¹¹ As was illustrated at the outset, this comes to the fore most explicitly in encounters between state functionaries and the citizen in his condition of state subject.¹² It also becomes manifest in the ways people approach “politics” to obtain certain benefits or simply the application of official rights.

I will concentrate on the two cases just mentioned: bureaucratic encounters and the ways the urban poor¹³ (in Quito, Santiago, and La Paz) approach “politics” to get things done for their neighborhood.¹⁴ This means that I will focus mainly upon the civil rights—the rights referring to the respect, liberties, impartial treatment, and equality the citizen is entitled to; and to a lesser degree upon political rights, particularly the right to participation and influence in the political realm. As these rights, in Marshall's view,¹⁵ are the foundation for the other ones (although not their precondition; rather, the three presuppose each other to be effective), their truncated realization would definitely affect the degree in which the other two are feasible.

The point, of course, is not only to avoid the top-down discussion and replace it with addressing how ordinary people live secluded from “the law.” Rather, the claim is to discuss how the *presence* of the law echoes in the ways people manage themselves in these types of situations and how they feel about their rights. As will be illustrated, the issue is not one of incompatibilities but of subtle permeation of official and nonofficial forms of “rights.” The focus in this discussion will therefore only be on some facets of civil and political rights and less on the dimension of social rights or on the concept of citizenship *per se*.

The importance of such a perspective is, I think, that if we want to make sense of currently changing conditions with regard to citizenship, including the impacts of globalization; “the information society”; and the reactions to current-day social movements', politicians', and international bodies' insistence on rights and political transparency, we need to deepen our comprehension of the previous trajectories the subjects embodying these changes went through.¹⁶

The current literature will briefly be reviewed and commented upon. Subsequently, the *presence* of the absence of citizenship among the urban poor in Latin America will be discussed, in two separate steps. First the focus will be upon the specific contents—and deviations—of notions and practices with regard to rights, entitlements, identities, liberties, and sovereignty, all crucial terms in both classic and current theorizing on citizenship. Second, the

presence, in spite of the apparent opposite, of classic and “canonical” criteria of citizenship¹⁷ will be addressed, as these surface in common people’s views and judgments about the deeds and misdeeds of politicians and state functionaries—a presence, as will be illustrated, which is not translated into practices in the encounters with these latter actors, but which functions as ethical and normative standard informing evaluations and current learning processes. The final section attempts to synthesize some of the findings.

THE PREDOMINANT FOCUS ON “ABSENCE” OF CITIZENSHIP

In many publications on the insufficient bearing of the citizen, the *democratic deficiencies* of both old and regained democracies in Latin America have been highlighted.¹⁸ Problems detected (and sometimes discussed in terms of current efforts to overcome them) are the fragility of the regained and not-yet consolidated democracies¹⁹ and the incapacity or unwillingness of political institutions to *represent* societal interests, identities, and diversity.²⁰ Others have focused upon the lack of interaction and dialogue between society and governments²¹ or the overideologized or, in recent times, overopportunistic party specter.²² Also the extreme socioeconomic inequalities;²³ the predominance of relational societies;²⁴ and corruption, nepotism, and prebendalism²⁵ have been highlighted. More recently, focuses have been upon the technocratization of politics,²⁶ the lack of state maneuvering due to neoliberal impositions and globalization,²⁷ the persisting predominance of authoritarianism,²⁸ the legacy of a culture of negation of the “other” as an explanation for the failure of citizenship to materialize,²⁹ the absence of a culture of rights,³⁰ and the neoliberal usurpation cum impoverishment of the citizenship concepts’ contents.³¹ All these features, it is argued, result in a crippled practice of citizenship.

The bulk of the literature thus focuses upon the incompleteness of the process of nation-building and the inadequacy and immaturity of democratic practices. In this view Latin America, in many respects, is not (yet) “rational”; its societies are not yet being based on the individual sovereignty, on equality in the valorization of the individual, and on civic-normative cultures.³² These societies are not (yet) “mature” enough to establish “decent” democracies, stable and ideologically consistent party systems, and impersonal bureaucratic practices.

However, this whole tradition of dealing with the issues of democracy and citizenship leads to analyses that tend to be teleological, normative, and anthropologically poor.³³ The focus mostly is upon the deficient institutionality, highlighting its fragileness, its incapacity or reluctance to apply the same rules to *anybody*, its lack of probity, and its vulnerability to a logic of small-circle-loyalty instead of complying with a logic of common

good.³⁴ In other cases, analyses focus upon political culture, highlighting the vices of authoritarianism, elitism, clientelism, nepotism, populism, corruption, and prebendalism, declaring all those cultural traits premodern. Especially in this latter tendency, political culture tends to be conceptualized as a universe in which the democratic order “as it should function” is permanently derailed by practices that corrupt it and rob it of its legitimacy and true democratic vocation. Culture, thus, appears as the obstacle, the phenomenon that blocks the democracy from functioning as it should.

All this leads to the detection of a long list of deficiencies: to a scarce participation, to a weak civil society in which the citizen is practically absent,³⁵ to political systems that are “irrational”³⁶ and incorporate an “authoritarian manipulative ingredient”³⁷ or even are marked by an “engrained authoritarian tradition . . . and an oligarchic configuration of politics in daily praxis.”³⁸ At a societal level, the deficiencies are that these are politically disarticulated, hardly trust in or are interested in politics,³⁹ are “abstentionalist and anti-party,”⁴⁰ and in alarming numbers incline to authoritarian rule.⁴¹

POLITICAL CULTURE AND CITIZENSHIP DOWN UNDER

The ways in which poor neighborhoods fight for the deliverance of urban services reveal that a citizens rights discourse is rarely applied. This becomes clear listening to both common shantytown settlers and their neighborhood *dirigentes*. One can often hear the latter paying verbal tribute to the discourse on rights, their entitlements as citizens and due obligations of governments and municipalities. But as one learns about how they actually operate to obtain benefits for their neighborhoods, it becomes clear that it is mere discourse. In practically all cases concerning the acquisition of certain *obras* (works) for their vicinity, hardly ever was the insistence on legal criteria, or on accredited entitlements, a central part of the strategy. Rather, the story is about “asking for help.” Neighborhood representatives go to the municipality, or its technical and executive bodies, and try to obtain access to the person “who is in charge.” To this person they explain the problem and ask for help. Most often, this person attempts to duck the responsibility for a decision on the matter, and the representatives’ quality, in such cases, lies in his ability to get access to the “higher” level. Often neighborhood leaders would boast about their astuteness in managing to “get through” to the people who really could take decisions and/or warrant that the promises would actually be observed. In cases the *dirigentes* failed to get the “works” done, they would most often explain this failure in terms of “I couldn’t get to the guy who is really in charge” or “they wouldn’t let me talk to the person who could take the decision.” All these narratives were in terms of access, friends, relations, and cogency, and hardly ever did the vocabulary appear that refers to regulations and stipulations being obeyed, to “rights being applied,” or to “norms being observed.”

The gap between the rights discourse and ordinary peoples' narratives of how things work is even greater. In more than fifty interviews realized in Ecuador and Chile in the years 1996 and 1997—which focused on neighborhood organizations—informants hardly ever referred to impersonal rights. *Barrio* histories, stories on organization, victories, vicissitudes of dealing with politicians and on how certain things were accomplished, were *always* stories about concrete *people*: leaders, local politicians, individuals who took initiatives or *knew* the right people, intermediaries such as representatives of the church or respected elderly. Reconstructions of how things were done, how the neighborhood “got this far,” lacked major allusions to the law, to municipal rules and edicts, and to the process of navigating through juridical formulations and its mazes. Exceptions were neighborhoods that originally were land seizures. In these cases, juridical stipulations and parameters were hinted at. However, in telling the story about how things finally were settled, once again the role of certain politicians and intermediaries came to the fore. The degree in which the final agreement did or did not observe the law, or the squatters' *rights*, or the legislation, was never part of the account people gave. Thus, even in cases in which the strife had an obvious juridical component, and in which the rights of the squatters and of the landowner beyond doubt must have been part and parcel of the negotiations and final compromise, the average squatter did not include the rights discourse in his or her tale about “how it went.”

Personal relations thus play a larger role than notions about rights as citizens and inhabitants of the city. But in what ways, then, is the “traditional” content of citizenship altered? The formulations used by the informants point at two ways in which this occurs.

First, the “existence” of official and formal citizenship takes place in a universe that is not common people's main life domain. References to the right of free speech, of religious liberty, of association, or to the rights to access and to representation in governmental bodies, and so forth, mean relatively little to people whose first worries are the lack of stable income, precarious housing and neighborhood conditions, school necessities for their children, and the ill-mannered behavior of counter clerks needed to obtain, for instance, a birth certificate. The most acute feelings of anxiety and insecurity in daily life and the most pressing problems are *not* those covered by the citizens rights tenets or those debated over in constitutional reforms. Official citizens rights are a “big” thing; people's daily experiences take place in “small” dailyness.

This perception culminates in incidental and particular rather than fundamental or aggregate demands from “the system.” The wish for a more decent functioning of present routines is much more close and relevant than the abstract claim to “fully install” all legal rights. What people concretely want is clemency in their particular case, decency from the part of the state's counter clerks, being *listened to* when they explain their problem, the freedom to choose a cheaper alternative for the cloth prescribed for the school uniform,

the absolving of their traffic ticket by an understanding police officer in case they are not blamable, the abolition of the arbitrariness to cut an hour of their work pay when they arrived three minutes late, and the like. Instead of striving for the installment and application of their prerogatives as citizens, they look for a more “understanding,” benevolent, and flexible treatment and the liberation of the indiscriminations they daily have to cope with. Legalistic emphases in talking about claimants’ rights do not meet people’s most stressing worries and perceptions of their worries.

Second, an important aspect is the auto-exclusion from the domain of legal regulations, formal ruling, and most public and political space. Given strong traditions of elitism, of relatively low schooling levels for the majority, and of the still strong remains of a hierarchical estate society, great majorities of the Latin Americans consider politics; legislation; and the world of statutes, jurisdiction, procedural resolutions, regulations, and the whole of legal terminology a hostile, inaccessible, and unfathomable world in which they are illiterates. They, under normal circumstances, would not dare to dispute the impositions of the personal in charge in that world. Vis-à-vis claims of anyone referring to articles, clauses, and paragraphs with regard to a particular bureaucratic procedure—or right or restriction of a right—they would mostly remain silent no matter how illogical or silly the claim would be. It simply is a “no-enter” land, a domain of public rule impervious to “our sort of public.” Much the same goes for politics. Rogelio expresses this auto-limitation, although he also makes a point of the fact that “in principle” things ought to be different (as will be elaborated in the next section):

Poor people . . . could make a difference and could influence things . . . if only they had access, and were prepared . . . if one studies one would understand what they from above are venting upon us all the time. (Rogelio, Quito, October 30, 1998)

Besides, as all too often expressed in informal conversations with Latin Americans, being considered a world of thieves and impostors, “politics” (and, for that matter, the judiciary) also is considered a world where many dangers lurk if one is not acquainted with the rules. Politicians (and lawyers), people feel, are a sly race, and uninformed people should not get mixed up in their bickering if they do not want to get hurt. As a result, common people tend to stay out of the domains where their rights are formulated and defended, and ought to be protected. The places where their rights, *as official rights*, are at stake and where they theoretically might find support for their complaints about actual rightlessness, are exactly the places they feel they do not have a trespassing permit.

This results in the felt obligation to leave in the hands of the politicians the things they are least willing and able to do: legislate and participate in society according to the laws agreed upon in Parliament. Talking about the evil of the

need for personal relationships to get things done, and how to get rid of it, Paquisha paradoxically transfers her proper responsibility immediately to the politicians, and takes it in her stride to disqualify them. So does, very categorically, Pía, whereas Octavio expresses some frustration but at the same time resignation with regard to the politicians' ways of "keeping people out."

To change things, to get rid of these *palanca*—things . . . well, those in Congress have to take the initiative . . . they are the *padres de la patria* [fathers of the fatherland], as they say . . . but they themselves must act according to a sort of "order" they should respect, one as well as the other . . . there are many bad apples there too . . . meanwhile, all we can do is work hard and honestly. (Paquisha, Quito, August 23, 1997)

Politicians . . . are born in a golden cradle and get buried in a golden coffin . . . they are the rich . . . we have to settle our own stuff. (Pía, Santiago, November 23, 1996)

The ugly thing really is that they [politicians] are talking about us all the time and about our country. But a common person does not know what is going on. All they do is taking good care of themselves, but they let nobody in on what they really are arranging. They have their own idiom, you know? (Octavio, La Paz, April 2000)

All this results in specific modalities of promoting one's interest, which often do not concur with citizens' legal and politically official modes. Instead of recurring to forms such as formal interest representation in the municipal councils, of having one's demand brought to the attention through due application forms or if necessary through parliamentary questions, or of forming civil interest groups and the like, people often opt for informal, clientelistic, or, more recently, at times mass media-centered forms to get their grievances heard. They do not feel comfortable with legal and formal vocabularies and protest channels, and they abstain from participating or expressing opinions in such terms. Relations, *patronazgo*, votes-negotiations, and loud, short-lived media scandals have proved much more effective, and are things people feel more familiarized with, than going the way of the formal anonymous defense of rights.⁴² Often, such "detour" tactics result in partial or short-term solutions, not in a more systematic attention for underprivileged neighborhoods or deprived groups, nor in them being attended according to their citizens rights.

These two aspects result in a presence of citizenship in which prevail particularism and ad hoc demands about rights application. Moreover, people value passive, beneficiary rights-as-grants above active, participatory rights, and auto-exclude themselves with regard to the deliberations on right formulations and claims. At first sight, such qualities deny the very essence of the idea of citizens rights. But at a closer look, they reveal how people manage apocryphal fragments of something they cannot have entirely, or "the ambiguity and indeterminateness of practices and representations manufactured out of the

subtle combinations of past and present values, experiences, doubts, and peoples' fears and expectations."⁴³ Demands and wishes do not reflect the final goal or "the whole thing" but the pieces within image-reach. They express the sensation of the insufficient public visibility of the status of citizens in the realm of experiences, in relation to the legal rationality of these societies.⁴⁴ This "legal rationality" is not completely absent from the assessment of reality, as will be argued below. But to get about, this standard is rather irrelevant. This is expressed by Pedro, and sarcastically commented upon by Armando (in his case with regard to performing bureaucratic obligations):

We of course hold on to it that we have the same rights as citizens as the rich . . . but in actual fact they have privileges . . . when they approach the authorities . . . well, they are the *señores* and we . . . let's just say that they [the authorities] see us on a little lower level. (Pedro, Quito, September 9, 1996)

What is the use of arguing with him [the state employee]? If he is in a bad mood, he won't help you anyway. You can only hope he had good sex that morning with his wife, so that he is in a good mood. Then he might help you. But it is no use to argue, that's for sure. (Armando, La Paz, April 2000)

The lack of references to the universe of established rights and to the due obligations of the state and its employees is even more remarkable, as illustrates Armando, when nonpolitical, ordinary encounters and affairs such as bureaucratic formalities are the theme of the narrative. People often meet with slight; poor infrastructure; hours-long waiting; and peevish, arrogant, and fickle employees, and *because* of this, paradoxically, give more importance to relations than to arguments about how rights ought to be complied with. This suggests that the perception of *rights* being violated is not a thing discursively present all the time but rather a latent evaluation pattern. People object, but this objection is not put to action. This mixture of latent negative judgment and daily coping is expressed by María:

The rich have their *palancas* at all places, they have their friends everywhere—they get out quickly [of official buildings and offices], whereas we don't have these friendships . . . for us it takes long, you have to queue, they send you from one place to the other . . . you just have to have patience. (María, Quito, September 24, 1996)

Here, to get your taxi-permit renewed, it really is a *calvario*. They let you wait for hours, and always say some document is not in order. That whole thing there, at *Transito* [traffic police offices], is a chaos. Often, you only leave after having paid at least 20 *Bolivianos* . . . or more. (La Paz taxi driver, January 2000)

In daily doing, then, people do not turn to a proactive claim of citizenship standards and concomitant rights and express almost resignation with regard to how things for them transpire. The word *almost* is necessary: it is not that people are not aware of the "wrong" (as will be elaborated below), but the thing is

that they see absolutely no point in protesting recurring to “their right.” In daily interaction, such behavior would not only produce derision or irritation among the ones who are denying decent, appropriate treatment, but also wonder among those who share the protestor’s lot. It is an unrealistic, atypical resource, and does not form part of the normal defense repertoire against the insecurity and capriciousness that besets them.

Consequently, the inability to claim rights is not easily undone by inserting knowledge about these rights. The daily reproductions of relations that contradict individuals’ (citizens’) equality resist fast refashioning. They are not only continuously reconfirmed by how the institutions and politics work but are also deeply embedded in people’s reactions and responses. People’s action, in the words of Lois McNay, entails “entrenched dimensions of embodied experiences that might escape processes of reflexive self monitoring.” In the view of McNay, it is crucial to understand such identities (in her case gender identities) not as the result of a “relatively straightforward and one-sided process of inculcation and normalisation” but as both a “relation of conditioning” as well as of a “relation of ‘cognitive construction’ whereby habitus is constitutive of the field in that it endows the latter with meaning, with ‘sense and value,’ in which it is worth investing one’s energy.”⁴⁵ This Bourdieu-inspired vocabulary, if we apply it to poor urban Latin Americans’ citizen identities, reveals that not a mere repression of citizen awareness or a “reparable” lack of consciousness is at stake, but that, rather, a creative and at times clever exploitation of predominant features combines with abstaining from the demand to be treated, formally, “righteously.”

Often, these clerks are badly prepared for their job. They work there because they know the boss, that’s all. Sometimes you can take advantage of them. For instance, you say that the other week you arranged the same matter with the same papers at hand. If you’re lucky, they believe you. (Militón, La Paz, March 2000)

HOW IT OUGHT TO BE: HOW UNWORKABLE STANDARDS WORK

Latin American urban poor manage their own, apocryphal contents and priorities with regard to practicing citizenship. At the same time, however, as already alluded to in the previous section, notions about rights that do reflect the creed of official citizens prerogatives are not completely lacking in their images. Most people are well aware of how they *should* be treated as citizens, of how politicians and government functionaries *ought* to behave, and of how institutions *must be* run. The presence of notions of due politics, due institutionality, and due citizenship thus turns out a little more than just formal or abstract. Latin American societies, it seems, operate “at the juncture of a

system composed of ideal norms and a legitimising system of social practices based on personal relations.”⁴⁶ The “ideal norms” are not completely inactive. With regard to the issue of clientelism and the corresponding views on politics and politicians, the point is well illustrated by Burgwal.⁴⁷ He argues, referring to the practices in a Quitenean squatter settlement, that many dwellers in a way accept the rules of the clientelistic game, and might in their explanations refer to the logic of give and take (give electoral support, take/receive benefits for their neighborhood), and to the image of a generous politician that deserves gratitude. They will, in their encounters with such politicians, even treat these with deference and stress the politicians’ power of disposal and their own dependency and role as recipients. Nevertheless, underneath the verbal submission, criteria crop up about what is correct. It is clearly, although not always explicitly, expressed that, for instance, existing *patronazco* relations should not be patronizing or work out as narrow collusions; and more in general, criteria to distinguish good and bad politicians surface.⁴⁸ In these criteria about good politicians, it is stressed that these politicians should be indifferent toward *whom* they are helping (they should focus upon the common good without considering friends, foes, and clans), and their plainness and sensitivity toward the needs of the poor are particularly valued. The not narrowly partisan politician, frank and honest, competent and not sectarian, who serves others rather than himself, in other words, the politician supposed to be prototypical for the “consolidated and mature democracy,” thus emerges as the model politician the urban poor dream of. The rejection of the practices of arbitrary clientelism also becomes present when this politician fails to deliver. In such cases, the shantytown dwellers might recur to open protest and even insults toward politicians, accusing them of exactly those things that in the first instance were the vehicles of the clientelist negotiating: particularism, unreliability, “payola-politics,” and unscrupulous maneuvering and politicking. Hence, not only latent awareness, but also practices that recur to notions of rights and correct politics, are at times present, simultaneously with concepts that reflect acceptance of and adaptation to routines that invalidate these notions. Identities with regard to citizenship are multifarious. They include both practices apparently revealing a lack of awareness of rights and of the notions about the correct appliance of these rights in a constitutional democracy, and a presence of cognizance about how things ought to be.

In a sort of “negative dialectics,” the arguments with which the lack of decent treatment and the revolting behavior of politicians in the view of the poor are indicted reveal the not often directly articulated criteria that according to them ought to govern.

Of course we have the same right to give our opinion! It’s just that they don’t listen to us. (Luciano, Quito, October 30, 1998)

Often there are people in there that are not at all prepared for the job. I personally feel that when they get in there they should give them a course in "human relations," because most of them don't know about that or don't apply it. You get into this office, and the secretary is polishing her nails, talking with the other secretary, or taking a coffee—and the people are waiting there in long queues. So one says: "*señorita*, please" . . . so it gets to the point when someone gets angry and says: "why don't you do what you are supposed to do, and attend these people?" So she says: "because I don't feel like it, or this is my break" and her break really is all day long. And if the *jefe* [the superior] comes in, and he put her there, even worse it gets. He shakes hands with her and gets out again . . . or the superior comes in and they write three or four letters on the computer and . . . over and out! That really is one easy thing that could be done in this country: that everybody working there would be prepared and willing to work. If we could only do that, we wouldn't be the way we are. (Leonidas, Quito, September 4, 1997)

People are aware that they should be treated otherwise, that they, officially, have the right to complain about arbitrariness and rudeness, that they have the right to express their anger. People, in a way *think* with citizen rights.

Things are really bad here. Nothing works. Not even the traffic lights. And "up there" they steal and lie, nothing else. And there is nothing to be done about it. What we need is decent and honest politicians, that do something for this country. Why don't some of your country come and help us out here? (Taxi driver, La Paz, May 2000)

However, this rights cognizance is not applied as an instrument to solicit one's right in concrete situations; it is present more as an image than as a practical tool. This ambiguity can help explain why the notion of rights is welcomed and referred to in stories about (experiences with) politicians and state bureaucracy and, at the same time, is left behind in concrete encounters.⁴⁹ To recognize or denounce (but never vis-à-vis state officials!) events of not being attended, or not being attended properly, or being treated badly, or being "abandoned" by politics, the notion of citizenship *works* for people. However, in concrete situations, they tend to fill in the idea with much more bare notions such as the wish to be lucky and be (correctly) attended in a particular case, and to receive fair and "delivering" treatment, irrespective of its "equality" quality. People, in this way, reproduce the ambiguity and interrelatedness of un-citizen-like practices and citizens' consciousness.

"There is . . . an apparently strong and very 'Western' support for a liberal concept of political and bureaucratic probity, and this in turn seemed to be closely linked to a modern and liberal concept of citizenship rights."⁵⁰ Citizenship acquires not only a specific stature in the sense that it works more as a moral code than as a practical wedge to open up state institutions or gain access to decisions on policies and to obtain efficient reply at state offices, but also in the sense that in make-do life it is fleshed out with exactly those qualities most

intensely felt as missing in contacts with politics and institutions in the day-to-day circumstances.

Really, in real life they screw you all the time . . . if you're not dressed up, they simply ignore you . . . if you don't have the money, they simply dismiss you. (Luciano, Quito, October 30, 1998)

Why can't they simply say: "this is what you need," and you get that and have it over with. But instead they think of something else every time you get there . . . just bugging you. (Taxi driver, La Paz, December 1999)

Whereas, on one hand, in concrete evaluations and considerations around politics, people "are not interested in ideology, ideas, principles, methods and objectives, but (only) in realizations," on the other hand, there is enormous trust in the law.⁵¹ The law represents order and due organization of things; it represents "the same rule for everybody" and embodies the promise of deliverance if the applicant complies with the (bureaucratic) prerequisites. Politicians and people with power do *not* go by the law, and that is exactly the problem.⁵² A self-identifying mechanism often observed among rank-and-file Latin Americans is that of grouping oneself with "the decent people." Poverty, unemployment, a shack for a house, all these things might apply to these people. Nonetheless the criterion of decency remains upheld. Decent are those that obey the elementary rules of coexistence with others: do not steal, do not lie, do not be pretentious, do not cheat others, respect others. This attitude obtains extra significance in the light of the fact that most people agree that their country does not live up to these virtues. In a way, they set the example: if everybody, especially politicians and state representatives, would behave as decently as they, the rank and file, do, their country would not be such a mess.

Our people are so credulous . . . they let themselves being cheated time and again. They [politicians], talk so nicely, and have such a nice face, so the people say: "all right, let's forgive him what he's done before." It looks as if the people are too meek, they fall again and again . . . always for the same guys, that this time seem to have bettered themselves. So the people say: "this one, let's see what he will realise this time" . . . We Ecuadorians are too understanding . . . but a good thing is that we [the poor] are often solidary, although not all . . . but the majority is willing to help the other guy, they smile towards the other, and are at his service. (Leonidas, Quito, September 4, 1997)

A double scenario is at work, in which, nevertheless, the standard of decency is not given up. Both in explaining and excusing their own maneuvering as well as in judging others' behavior, the model is alive of a decent society, where rights are respected, dignity is endowed to all, and probity guides human interaction. People *know* about rights and citizens' entitlements. They *think* with it. But it would be folly on their part to try to employ these rights in real life.

BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

In a burlesque tone, Escalante, speaking of Mexico, mocks the obtuse citizen:

The citizen goes about applying little logic and with an awkward lack of practical sense. For instance, everybody knows that it is much better for our health and peacefulness of mind to simply pay the payola to whomever is entitled, and forget about the thing as soon as possible. The citizen, however, either simply doesn't know, or pretends not to know, and once he gets into it, he doesn't pay neither forgets about it, neither lives on peacefully, neither allows the others to do so; he can take months in complaints and denunciations, writing letters and accusations . . . ; (really) one needs a good nose to distinguish him from the lout or simple idiot.⁵³

In his parody, Escalante goes as far as to call him a pain in the neck for not smoothly going by the rules of the game. He is probably right, in the sense that most Latin Americans do not insist on probity, politeness, and efficiency in daily dealing with state dependencies and politics. To do otherwise would be unproductive and would most likely evoke advice from others to do otherwise and, in case of insistence, their repulse.

What people make of citizenship in cases when the sociocultural foundations for the existence of its classical orthodoxy do not apply is something apt for the circumstances. It looks as if, first and for all, people appreciate *being attended*. Rights, in their conception, refer less to their access to participation, proactive action, initiative to intervene, or personal lifestyle freedom but to their entitlement, interpreted as a particular, not universal, thing to be addressed properly by the state and by the state's policies. "Rights" thus refer to the "delivering," honorable, and decent operation of the practices embodying their dependence on higher powers, the state in the first place.⁵⁴ The right to have a say, to get elected, to join in deliberations about policies, is less a worry than is the right to *get something*. A passive contents of citizenship predominates over one in which the "sovereign individual" rules. Citizenship is more about being treated than about acting. And it is more about people's attitudes than about societal structures and legislation.⁵⁵ This translates into an emphasis on being *beneficiaries* more than on being bequeathed access to active involvement and membership in societal institutions and political bodies. Citizenship is associated less with formal equality in the right to partake than with concretely *being considered* in measures taken, benefits being distributed, and bureaucratic formalities being dispatched.

This indifference regarding the active participation as part and parcel of "mature citizenship" (a great worry for Jelín and for Calderón and Zmuckler⁵⁶), in the "collective will" to help the country forward, probably echoes the feelings of being incompetent in the joint endeavor "of the country,"

and this in turn echoes the lifelong history of effective exclusion. For many Latin Americans, "legislation" is done *elsewhere*.

But to overcome the vocabulary of "absence" or insufficiency of citizenship, it is crucial to highlight the way these experiences are transformed into practices, resignifications, and strategies that enable people to move ahead and become agents in an engraved civil-agency-unfriendly culture. Latin Americans' focus upon favors and benefits does not stand for passivity or "absence" but for active, creative, and flexible handling of citizen-adverse conditions.

Simultaneously, the notion of due citizenship is present and used in assessing experiences. In such assessments, institutions' functioning and politicians' behavior fall short of the standard. The standard, in turn, interlinks with practices that reveal a self-restricting, dependent, public-space-avoiding citizen, who is, however, at the same time, cunning in managing the conditions under which his citizenship is allowed to be.

In recent decades, sociopolitical circumstances in Latin America have undergone dramatic changes. The scant welfare structure crumbled under the restructuring measures, and the obligation of the state "to take care" evaporated from political discourses.⁵⁷ On the other hand, global discourses on transparency and good governance, and the rejection of the history of authoritarianism, gained in strength. They match with an increasing critique on the flaws of existing democratic structures, and with a reorientation of the traditional Left attributing democracy and citizenship unprecedented vigor. All this has given the idea of citizenship central stage in current Latin American political contestation. However, if we hope to understand the ways in which common Latin Americans will react to these changing political parameters, we first of all need to comprehend what they used to make of citizenship given the past trajectories of their countries.

NOTES

1. Bureaucracies are notorious for absurdity all over the globe. Nevertheless, there is a difference: in Western Europe and North America, bizarre anecdotes are recognized as bizarre and illustrative for how obnoxious large administrative apparatuses can get. In Latin America, as I was once told, "Kafka would never have drawn so much attention." In other words, the incredible stories are much more common and are met with much more stoicism.

2. Sergio Ramirez, "Vigores disperses (Centroamérica: los retos pendientes de la construcción democrática)," Working Papers Series: Issues in Culture, Democracy and Development 2 (College Park: Latin American Studies Center, University of Maryland, 1999), 8; Julio Echeverría, "La democracia enfrentada a la complejidad," in *Ecuador Debate* 42 (Quito: CAAP, 1997), 74-82, at 77.

3. Renato Rosaldo, "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality and Multiculturalism," in Rodolfo D. Torres, Louis F. Mirón, and Jonathan Xavier Inda, eds., *Race, Identity and Citizenship* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 253-61, at 259. Cf. Ignacio T. Abello, "Identidad y diferencia," in Abello T. Ignacio, Sergio de Zubiría, and Silvio Sánchez, eds., *Cultura: teorías y gestión* (San Juan de Pasto, Colombia: Ediciones Unariño, 1998), 104-33; Sergio de Zubiría Samper, "Momentos de la identidad cultural latinoamericana/Identidades modernas y posmodernas en Latinoamérica," in *Cultura: teorías y gestión*, 134-73.

4. Speaking of "Latin America" as a whole bears great risks. Although I maintain that my argument does apply to Latin America in a general sense, I am aware that differences exist and that, moreover, things are not static: in many Latin American countries, struggles for "fuller" citizenship mark present political contestation.

5. In a very interesting article, Engelke discusses the "moral sentiments" involved in perceptions of human rights. He addresses the broad rejection of homosexuality as being "un-African" in Zimbabwe and the resistance against the argument of the human right to sexual preference as an illustration of the futility of insisting on the purely legal discourse. In the words of one of the spokespersons of the adversaries, in defiance of the advocates of the human rights argument, "We wondered what human rights he was talking about." Although in another context, and dealing with another problematic, the case illustrates that "human rights talk rarely means the same thing in different places" (p. 291). The same goes, I argue, for citizenship. Matthew Engelke, "'We Wondered What Human Rights He Was Talking About': Human Rights, Homosexuality and the Zimbabwe International Book Fair," *Critique of Anthropology* 19, no. 3 (1999): 289-314.

6. The classical triad Marshall left us. We will return to this legacy below. T. H. Marshall, *Class, Citizenship and Social Development* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1965).

7. Marshall, *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*; see M. Bulmer and Anthony M. Rees, eds., *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H. Marshall* (London: UCL Press, 1996).

8. Marshall, *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*; Bulmer and Rees, *Citizenship Today*.

9. This "fourth generation" of rights is the one that refers to collective rights and is one of the main issues in current indigenous demands toward the state. They cover group rights within a greater society. As such, they unsettle the groundwork of the classical rights, since these are fundamentally *individual* rights. In this respect, they have a lot in common with my present ambition: to *multiply* our concept of citizens' rights (cf. Will Kymlicka, *Ciudadanía multicultural* [Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós, 1996]; Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema, "Diversity as a Challenge: A Note on the Dilemmas of Diversity," in Willem Assies, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema, eds., *The Challenge of Diversity: Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America* [Amsterdam: Thesis, 2000]; Donna Lee Van Cott, *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin America* [Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000]; and Joseph H. Carens, *Culture, Citizenship and Community—A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000]). However, since the debate on collective rights is a very broad and extensive one, and emphasizes different aspects, I leave it out in the present text.

10. Andrés Pérez Baltodano, "Estado, ciudadanía y política social: una caracterización del desarrollo de las relaciones entre Estado y sociedad en América Latina," in Andrés Pérez Baltodano, ed., *Globalización, ciudadanía y política social en América Latina: tensiones y contradicciones* (Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 1997), 31-66.

11. Roberto Da Matta, "The Quest for Citizenship in a Relational Universe," in John B. Wirth, Edson de Oliveira Nunes, and Thomas E. Bogenschield, eds., *State and Society in Brazil—Continuity and Change* (Boulder: Westview, 1987), 307-35; Guillermo O'Donnell, *Counterpoints—Selected Essays on Authoritarianism and Democratization* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 81 ff.; and cf. Lucy Taylor, *Citizenship, Participation and Democracy: Changing Dynamics in Chile and Argentina* (London: Macmillan, 1998), 3.

12. To be sure, this state functionary very often is also a poorer citizen. But the fact that he or she will often suffer bad treatment as well does not change the logic, in which arbitrariness prevails over procedures, because particularism rules in either case.

13. That is an unprecise denomination. I suspect that the problematic with regard to citizenship affects the whole of Latin American societies, but in varying degrees and manifestations (cf. O'Donnell, *Counterpoints*). However, since I did research among urban poor in Quito, La Paz, and Santiago, I restrict my analysis to those sectors. They are the shantytown dwellers, sometimes immigrants, often majorities in the larger cities but underrepresented in political spheres. They are the subject of my interpretation, but I think it safe to extend most of what I state to, in general, the lower and lower-middle classes in Latin America, and will suggest so in the text.

14. This article is based on fieldwork information obtained in Chile in the years 1989 to 1998 and in Ecuador in the years 1996 to 1999. Additionally, it is based on a series of conversations with "ordinary and poor Bolivians" in the city of La Paz, such as market sellers, street shoe repairers, *empleadas* and their families, and taxi drivers in the years 1997 to 2000.

15. Marshall, *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*.

16. Taylor, *Citizenship, Participation and Democracy*; Duncan Green, "A Trip to the Market: The Impact of Neoliberalism in Latin America," in Julia Buxton and Nicola Phillips, eds., *Developments in Latin American Political Economy—States, Markets and Actors* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 13-32, at 28-9; Pérez Baltodano, *Globalización, ciudadanía y política social en América Latina*, 43; Elizabeth Jelín and Eric Hershberg, coordinators, *Construir la democracia: derechos humanos, ciudadanía y sociedad en América Latina* (Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 1996, 122); and Alberto Olvera Rivera, "Conclusión," in Alberto J. Olvera, coordinator, *La sociedad civil: de la teoría a la realidad* (México D.F.: El Colegio de México), 339-62, at 362.

17. "Citizenship" is currently discussed in many different ways and distinguished in many different realms. Most common is, of course, the revision of the triad of civil, political, and social rights (Marshall, *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*, 1965) and the distinction between the sphere of rights and obligations, on one hand, and the sphere of "belonging" to a community, on the other (Kymlicka, *Ciudadanía multicultural*; Ralf Dahrendorf, "La naturaleza cambiante de la ciudadanía," in *La Política- Revista de estudios sobre el Estado y la sociedad* 3 [October 1997]: 139-49, at 142; Fernando Calderón and Alicia Zmuckler, *Ciudadanía activa y desarrollo sostenible* [La Paz: Ministerio de Desarrollo Sostenible y Planificación/PNUD, 1998], 26). In the present text, to reiterate, the focus will not be on a discussion of conceptual dimensions or distinctions but on the civil rights, the experience of individual dignity and sovereignty, as manifestations of citizens' identity and on the relations with the political universe in the context of specific political cultures.

18. Oscar Landi, "La trama cultural de la política," in Norbert Lechner, compiler, *Cultura política y democratización* (Santiago: FLACSO/CLACSO/ICI, 1987), 39-64; Felipe Agüero and Jeffrey Stark, eds., *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America* (Miami: University of Miami, North-South Center Press, 1998); Gonzalo Rojas Ortuste, *De ángeles, demonios y política—Ensayos sobre cultura y ciudadanía* (La Paz: Muela del Diablo Editores, 1999), 71 ff.; Pérez Baltodano, *Globalización, ciudadanía y política social en América Latina*; Pablo González Casanova and Marcos Roitman Rosenmann, coordinators, *La democracia en América Latina: actualidad y perspectivas* (México: UNAM/Demos, 1995); Simón Pachano, *Democracia sin sociedad* (Quito: ILDIS, 1996); and Taylor, *Citizenship, Participation and Democracy*.

19. Wendy Hunter, "Civil-Military Relations in Argentina, Brazil and Chile: Present Trends, Future Prospects," in Agüero and Stark, eds., *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, 299-322; Felipe Agüero, "Conflicting Assessments of Democratization: Exploring the Fault Lines," in Agüero and Stark, eds., *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, 1-20; and Tomás Moulian, *Chile actual: anatomía de un mito* (Santiago: LOM/ARCIS, 1997), 45 ff.

20. Pachano, *Democracia sin sociedad*; Sarah Radcliffe and Sally Westwood, *Rehaciendo la nación—Lugar, identidad y política en América Latina* (Quito: Abya-Yala, 1999).

21. Simón Pachano, "La democracia y la modernización de las instituciones," in Simón Pachano, coordinator, *Modernización de las instituciones democráticas: el congreso* (Quito: FLACSO, 1997), 9-19; Manuel Antonio Garretón, "Cultura política y política cultural," in Manuel Antonio Garretón, Saúl Sosnowski, and Bernardo Subercaseaux, *Cultura, autoritarismo y redemocratización en Chile* (Santiago: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993); and H. C. F. Mansilla, *Tradición autoritaria y modernización imitativa—dilemas de la identidad colectiva en América Latina* (La Paz: Plural Editores, 1997), 125 ff.

22. On Chile, respectively, on both features, Manuel Antonio Garretón, *The Chilean Political Process* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989); Moulian, *Chile actual*.

23. Atilio A. Borón, "Faulty Democracies? A Reflexion on the Capitalist 'Fault Lines' in Latin America," in Agüero and Stark, *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, 41-65; Carlos M. Vilas, "Participation, Inequality, and the Whereabouts of Democracy," in Douglas A. Chalmers, Carlos M. Vilas, Kathryn Hite, Scott B. Martin, Kerianne Piester, and Monique Segarra, eds., *The New Politics of Inequality in Latin America: Rethinking Participation and Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 3-42; and José Sánchez Parga, *Lo público y la ciudadanía en la construcción de la democracia* (Quito: ILDIS, 1995), 47.

24. Da Matta, "The Quest for Citizenship in a Relational Universe."

25. Mansilla, *Tradición autoritaria y modernización imitativa*.

26. Moulian, *Chile actual*.

27. Norbert Lechner, "The Transformations of Politics," in Agüero and Stark, *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, 21-39; Jeffrey Stark, "Globalisation and Democracy in Latin America," in Agüero and Stark, *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*, 67-96; and Borón, "Faulty Democracies?"

28. Mansilla, *Tradición autoritaria y modernización imitativa*.
29. Fernando Calderón, Martín Hopenhayn, and Ernesto Ottone, *Esa esquivia modernidad; Desarrollo, ciudadanía y cultura en América Latina y el Caribe* (Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 1996), 62 ff.
30. Evelina Dagnino, "Culture, Citizenship and Democracy: Changing Discourses and Practices of the Latin American Left," in Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, eds., *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures—Re-Visioning Latin American Social Movements* (Boulder: Westview, 1998), 33-63; and Raúl Rojas Soriano and Amparo Ruiz del Castillo, *Apuntes de la vida cotidiana* (México: Plaza y Valdéz Editores, 1991), 137-42.
31. Veronica Schild, "New Subjects of Rights? Women's Movements and the Construction of Citizenship in the 'New Democracies,'" in Alvarez, Dagnino, Escobar, *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures*, 93-117.
32. Bernardo Kliksberg, "Un tema estratégico: el rol del capital social y la cultura en el proceso de desarrollo," Working Papers Series (College Park: Latin American Studies Center, University of Maryland, 1999).
33. Franklin Ramirez, "Explorando en un agujero negro," *Íconos* (FLACSO, Quito) 7 (1999): 46-59, at 46. For an exception, on the case of the historical formation of the citizen in the United States, see Fred Twine, *Citizenship and Social Rights—The Interdependence of Self and Society* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994).
34. Cf. Wil Pansters, "The Transition under Fire: Rethinking Contemporary Mexican Politics," in Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt, eds., *Societies of Fear—The Legacy of Civil War, Violence and Terror in Latin America* (London: Zed Books), 235-63, at 260.
35. José Sánchez Parga, José, *Ecuador: la democracia esquivia* (Quito: ILDIS, 1991); Pachano, *Democracia sin sociedad*; cf. Ramirez, "Explorando en un agujero negro."
36. Fernando Bustamante, "Problemas de gobernabilidad y democracia en el Ecuador de fin del milenio," *Ecuador Debate* 42 (1997): 53-64, at 62.
37. Fábio Wanderley Reis, "Civismo, intereses y ciudadanía democrática," in Elizabeth Jelin and Eric Hershberg, coordinators, *Construir la democracia: derechos humanos, ciudadanía y sociedad en América Latina* (Caracas: Nueva Sociedad, 1996), 131-47, at 140.
38. Mansilla, *Tradición autoritaria y modernización imitativa*, 219.
39. According to, for instance, a poll held end 1999 in Bolivia, Parliament is the public institution with the least trust, lesser even than lawyers. (*La Prensa*, December 15, 1999). Tellingly, according to a poll in Ecuador in June 2000, the poor tend to care less about "democracy" than the middle and higher classes (*Hoy*, June 11, 2000); cf. Bustamante, "Problemas de gobernabilidad y democracia"; Jorge Nuñez, "La democracia en Ecuador: actualidad y perspectivas," in Pablo Gozález Casanova and Marcos Roitman Rosenmann, coordinators, *La democracia en América Latina: actualidad y perspectivas* (México: UNAM/Demos, 1995), 285-323, at 314; Jorge Parodi and Eduardo Valenzuela, "La política y los pobres de Lima y Santiago: una visión comparativa," in Jorge Parodi, ed., *Los pobres, la ciudad y la política* (Lima: Cedy, 1993), 91-120; Gerardo Berthin Siles and Ernesto Yáñez, *Qué sabemos sobre el desarrollo democrático Boliviano?* (La Paz: Punto Cero, 1999), 43; and Ronaldo Munck, "After the Transition: Democratic Disenchantment in Latin America," *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 55 (1993): 7-19, at 15-8.
40. Luis Salamanca, "La democracia venezolana desde 1989," *Nueva Sociedad* 150 (1997): 106-11, at 109.
41. Calderón, Hopenhayn, and Ottone (1996, 90).
42. Tón Salman, "Politico-Cultural Models and Collective Action Strategies—The Pobladores of Chile and Ecuador in Search for Effective Political Pressuring and Lobbying," in Luis Roniger and Tamar Herzog, eds., *Collective Identities, Public Spheres and Political Order—Latin American Dynamics* (Brighton/Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2000).
43. Alberto Arce and Norman Long, "Reconfiguring Modernity and Development from an Anthropological Perspective," in Alberto Arce and Norman Long, eds., *Anthropology, Development and Modernities—Exploring Discourses, Counter-Tendencies and Violence* (London: Routledge, 2000), 1-31, at 14.
44. Mario C. Constantino Toto, "Tensiones de fin de siglo: ciudadanía y multiculturalidad," *Ecuador Debate* 42 (1997): 209-16, at 212.
45. Lois McNay, "Gender, Habitus and the Field—Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity," *Theory, Culture & Society* 16, no. 1 (1999): 95-117, quotes at 103, 97, 100.
46. Da Matta, "The Quest for Citizenship," 328.

47. Gerrit Burgwal, *Struggle of the Poor—Neighbourhood Organization and Clientelist Practice in a Quito Squatter Settlement* (Amsterdam: CEDLA, 1995); and Gerrit Burgwal, "Prácticas cotidianas de resistencia," in Ton Salman and Eduardo Kingman, eds., *Antigua Modernidad y Memoria del Presente—Culturas Urbanas e Identidad* (Quito: FLACSO, 1999), 165-87.
48. Burgwal, "Prácticas cotidianas de resistencia," 172-85.
49. Cf. Néstor García Canclini, *Culturas híbridas: Estrategias para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad* (México: Grijalbo, 1990); Néstor García Canclini, *Consumidores y ciudadanos: Conflictos multiculturales de la globalización* (México D.F.: Grijalbo, 1995) 169 ff.
50. David Lehmann, "Modernity and loneliness: Popular culture and the informal economy in Quito and Guadalajara," *European Journal of Development Research* 2 (1990): 89-107, at 91.
51. Jorge Enrique Adoum, *Ecuador: señas particulares* (Quito: Eskeletra Editorial, 1997), 100-1, 108).
52. "Encuestas y Estudios," *Percepción ciudadana: encuesta sobre la inestabilidad política y gobernabilidad en las ciudades de La Paz y El Alto* (La Paz: Ministerio de Desarrollo Sostenible y Planificación, Viceministerio de Planificación Estratégica y Participación Popular; Area de Investigacion: "Encuestas y Estudios" 1999).
53. Fernando Escalante, "El ciudadano," in Enrique Florenscano, coordinator, *Mitos Mexicanos* (Mexico: Aguilar, 1995), 185-8, at 185.
54. Lehmann (1990, 92).
55. Ibid., 95.
56. Elizabeth Jelín, "Cómo construir ciudadanía? Una visión desde abajo," *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 55 (1993): 21-37, at 25-6; and Calderón and Zmuckler, *Ciudadanía activa y desarrollo sostenible*.
57. Taylor, *Citizenship, Participation and Democracy*.

Ton Salman studied philosophy and cultural anthropology at the University of Amsterdam. He did his Ph.D. on grassroots organizations in Chilean shantytowns during dictatorship. He has published on urban culture and urban social movements, political culture, citizenship, and democratic transitions in Latin America. Currently, he works in the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology at Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.